

Date: Thu, 27 Jan 94 04:30:12 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #24  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Thu, 27 Jan 94                      Volume 94 : Issue    24

Today's Topics:

                    Antenna Lawsuit (3 msgs)  
                    ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses (2 msgs)  
                    Code: Guaranteeing long-term proficiency :)  
                    Has Renewal Procedure Changed?  
                    Mail,etc. over packet  
                    The 10-meter bands - No CW required?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 25 Jan 1994 18:33:58 GMT  
From: news.mentorg.com!hpcan240.mentorg.com!wv.mentorg.com!hanko@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Antenna Lawsuit  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jan24.141620.16398@cs.brown.edu>, md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu  
(Michael P. Deignan) writes:

|> In article <940123131950\_70371.111\_CHI30-1@CompuServe.COM>,  
|> Don Stoner <70371.111@CompuServe.COM> writes:  
|>  
|> |> Stoner maintains the action of 440 West, Inc., has  
|> |> violated his civil rights and freedom of speech. W6TNS  
|> |> alleges that as a result of the actions of the  
|> |> Association, he is no longer able to talk with his  
|> |> friends, made as a ham radio operator in the past 40  
|> |> years.  
|>

|> Of course, one has to ask, if ham radio was so important to Don Stoner,  
|> then why would he purchase a piece of property with an antenna  
|> restriction in the first place?  
|>  
|> MD  
|> --  
|> -- Michael P. Deignan  
|> -- Population Studies & Training Center  
|> -- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912  
|> -- (401) 863-7284

Because in many areas of the country, there ARE no properties  
available WITHOUT antenna restrictions.

... Hank

--

Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics  
Internet : hank\_oredson@mentorg.com  
Amateur Radio: WORLI@WORLI.OR.U.SA.NOAM

-----  
Date: Tue, 25 Jan 1994 01:42:00 GMT  
From: nntp.ucsb.edu!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!chip.ucdavis.edu!  
ez006683@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Antenna Lawsuit  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Michael P. Deignan (md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu) wrote:

: Of course, one has to ask, if ham radio was so important to Don Stoner,  
: then why would he purchase a piece of property with an antenna  
: restriction in the first place?

Perhaps it was all an attempt to provide amateur operators everywhere  
case law to combat such ridiculous CC&R's it would not be a big deal if  
one could choose to either buy property with or without such limitations  
but the sad fact is that in many communities ALL newer homes have CC&R's.

Someone has to be the first to fight such restrictions.

Dan

--

\*-----\*  
\* Daniel D. Todd            Packet: KC6UUD@KE6LW.#nocal.ca.usa            \*

```

*                Internet: ddtodd@ucdavis.edu                *
*                Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102                *
*                Davis CA 95616                                *
*-----*
*        I do not speak for the University of California....  *
*        and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!          *
*-----*

```

-----

Date: Wed, 26 Jan 1994 16:26:15 GMT  
 From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!  
 usenet.ins.cwru.edu!eff!news.kei.com!world!dts@network.ucsd.edu  
 Subject: Antenna Lawsuit  
 To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jan26.040309.20316@boy.com> pat@boy.com (It's just Pat!) writes:

```

>I've been a Ham 20 years; have an extra ticket.
>
>I wouldn't dream of offending my Los Altos neighbors with
>an ugly antenna. I use a dipole than can't be seen from the
>street (or by my neighbors unless they knew what it was!)
>
>If I lived in a rural area, I'd have a tower.
>
>If anyone on my block were to put up an antenna, I'd be the
>first to sue them!
>
>Put in in perspective--a BIG ugly tower next door to you would
>make your property worthless. CC&Rs are wonderful for

```

You have proof for this, I assume? Studies that have been done show the opposite is true.

```

>preserving a neighborhood's charm and character. If you live on a small
>lot, you should be respectful of your neighbors.
>
>(Of course, _blanket_ restrictions against antennas are wrong. However, a
>restriction against towers or structures higher than, say, 10' above
>the roofline are a good idea.)
>
>--
>Pat S.
>
>p.s.: why are all hams so concerned about strict license requirements
>for their RADIOS, but wouldn't want any license requirments for
>their GUNS?

```

>

It would be helpful in your arguments if you used the word "many" rather than the word "all." The statement above is FALSE. There are at least SOME hams in the population who would prefer if guns did not exist, but are concerned about radio issues, especially freedom to erect towers.

--

```
-----
Daniel Senie                Internet:    dts@world.std.com
Daniel Senie Consulting      n1jeb@world.std.com
508-365-5352                Compuserve:  74176,1347
-----
```

Date: Wed, 26 Jan 94 00:07:05 EST  
From: agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

```
> In article <CK6rp4.Azy@world.std.com>,
>   drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:
>
> |> I don't see what public policy is served by having them retake
> |> the exams.
>
> 1. It insures that they will be familiar with new operating rules
>   which have been enacted during their prolonged hiatus.
>
> 2. It insures that they will be familiar with new technology being
>   used in amateur radio after their hiatus.
>
> Look at some of the new innovative modes implemented over the past
> few years. Someone who was licensed in 1982 wouldn't be familiar with
> today's regulations, let alone technology. Retesting would be a
> correct step to assure they do. (Assuming theory tests were beefed
> up and not dumbed-down further.)
```

Exactly my point Michael. If the information tested for in the exams is important (I feel that is is) then it should be periodically retested. If Manually Encoded Morse is important, it too should be periodically retested.

>

>  
> MD  
> --  
> -- Michael P. Deignan  
> -- Population Studies & Training Center  
> -- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912  
> -- (401) 863-7284

```
|-----|
| Dan Pickersgill | dan@mystis.wariat.org | ac447@po.cwru.edu |
|-----|
|           Climate is what we expect, weather is what we get.           |
|                               -Lazarus Long                               |
|-----|
```

-----  
Date: Tue, 25 Jan 94 23:57:47 EST  
From: agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

> Dan Pickersgill N8PKV (dan@mystis.wariat.org) wrote:  
>  
> : But if a person treats they amateur license with so little respect that  
> : they let it laps, should they not EARN the privilage again by  
> : retesting? In fact should not we all EARN access to the ham bands by  
> : re-testing, instead of GIVING it away for no effort!  
>  
> Well, there is that, but if someone drops out of the hobby for a  
> while, say to work 3 jobs to put kids through college, and the license  
> lapses, and then they have more time and want to play with radios  
> again, I don't see what public policy is served by having them retake  
> the exams. The only thing people like this don't do to "earn" their  
> privs that we \*do\* do is remember to file a 610 at least once a decade  
> - easily missed, since the FCC never notifies you you're license is  
> about to expire. Big deal. It may have little to do with contempt  
> for the license and more to do with setting rational priorities or  
> natural human forgetfulness. For the 3.2 cases of this that will come  
> up each year, my feeling is, who cares?

If you forget to renew your Driver's License (at least in most states)  
you get to retake the test to reprove you are still able to safely  
operate a motor vehicle.

And basically I agree, 'who cares'?

```
|-----|
| Dan Pickersgill   |   dan@mystis.wariat.org   |   ac447@po.cwru.edu   |
|-----|
|           Climate is what we expect, weather is what we get.           |
|                               -Lazarus Long                               |
|-----|
```

-----

Date: Mon, 24 Jan 1994 13:45:33 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!paladin.american.edu!darwin.sura.net!  
jabba.ess.harris.com!news.ess.harris.com!su102w.ess.harris.com!  
jhobson@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Code: Guaranteeing long-term proficiency :)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>In <CK01sA.FHz@ra.nrl.navy.mil> drumhell@claudette.nrl.navy.mil (David  
Drumheller) writes:

>>If they do pass, well, they  
>>don't ever have to use it again as long as they don't let their license  
>>expire.

>This "loop-hole" has always amazed me!

I'm reading a book about this now. So I'll let you know when I figure  
it out. The book is Clancy's "Without ReMorse".

-----

Date: 25 Jan 1994 18:44:54 GMT  
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!news.Brown.EDU!  
NewsWatcher!user@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Has Renewal Procedure Changed?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jan25.074510.16879@hemlock.cray.com>, n3022@cray.com (Jim  
Knoll) wrote:

> Can someone help me out?  
>  
> I renewed my General Class license back in 1984, and now  
> it's time to renew again this year. What is the procedure for  
> renewing? I think in '84 I used the 'ole 610 form.  
> Does it vary from state to state. I live in Minnesota.

>  
> Thanks for your help,  
>  
> Jim  
> n3022@cray.com

No changes.... just send a completed form 610 with the appropriate box checked off for renewal. Be careful though, if you mess it up they WILL send it back. I've noticed that direct inquiries and renewals sent to the FCC at Gettysburg tend to be processed within 3-4 weeks.

Tony

--

== Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR  
== Anthony\_Pelliccio@Brown.edu  
== Brown University Alumni & Development Computing Services  
== Box 1908  
== Providence, RI 02912  
== (401) 863-1880

-----

Date: Wed, 26 Jan 1994 16:15:46 GMT  
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!newncar!csn!col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!cupnews0.cup.hp.com!jholly@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Mail,etc. over packet  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Ian P McCullough (ipm@world.std.com) wrote:

: I recently downloAded the FAQ for packet radio as i am thinking of  
: getting back into ham radio. I noticed, while reading this FAQ that a  
: recurring theme seems to be the necessity of hand filtering of stuff for  
: profanity. My question is... While not exactly in the open spirit of ham  
: radio, would it be illegal to encrypt something with profanity in it with  
: say PGP or some equivalent and then send it in the normal fashion. It  
: seems as though the legality is correct but the morality is wrong. What  
: are the details here?

: Opinions?? Specifics??

: Ian  
: KA1VQM

quoting from 97.113(a)(4)

(4) Music using a phone emission except as specifically provided elsewhere in this Section; Communications intended to facilitate a criminal act; Messages in codes or ciphers intended to obscure the meaning





>  
> -Dave  
> --  
> David Drumheller, KA3QBQ                      phone: (202) 767-3524  
> Acoustics Division, Code 7140                fax: (202) 404-7732  
> Naval Research Laboratory  
> Washington, DC 20375-5350    e-mail: drumhell@claudette.nrl.navy.mil

Well stated Dave. A very rational and realistic observation.

73 >< Carl  
K8NHE

-----  
Date: Fri, 21 Jan 1994 17:54:43 GMT  
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!  
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!  
ez006683@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CJwBoD.59I@ucdavis.edu>, <CJwv58.KJp@iat.holonet.net>,  
<1994Jan21.013214.3540@tower>et  
Subject : Re: Why I hate coordinating bodies

climatol@gnv.ifas.ufl.edu wrote:  
: In article <CJwv58.KJp@iat.holonet.net>, bwilkins@iat.holonet.net (Bob Wilkins  
n6fri) writes:

: The ARRL probably creates more public policy (concerning amateur radio)  
: than does the FCC itself. It is very rare that the FCC initiates a change  
: in the regulations on its own, rather than as a response to a petition,  
: and even rarer that it enacts regulations that the ARRL opposes.

Wrong answer, the FCC accepts input from all US citizens, maybe even  
others, I don't know. They take this under advisement and then take  
action as they see fit. If you think the ARRL makes public radio policy  
without recourse look at these two scenarios.

- 1) A repeater coordination body makes a coordination which causes serious interference between two or more repeaters.
- 2) The ARRL suggests that only they should have the ability to run a military/club callsign program.

In scenario 1 the FCC is required by part 97 to accept the coordination.

In scenario 2 the FCC decided to cancel the program all together.

While it is true that the ARRL is very influential in Washington and Gettysberg, they granted the right to create public policy and limit access to the airwaves.

: Sorry, Bob. I used more than three lines. Do I get demerits?

perhaps ad hocs deserve more demerits than lack of brevity.  
If you can give an example where the ARRL actually makes regulatory policy it would make a better argument.

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@KE6LW.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                      Internet: ddtodd@ucdavis.edu            *
*                      Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102           *
*                      Davis CA 95616                         *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

-----

Date: Tue, 25 Jan 1994 04:39:29 GMT  
From: nntp.ucsbs.edu!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!chip.ucdavis.edu!  
ez006683@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CK01sA.FHz@ra.nrl.navy.mil>,  
<1994Jan24.141750.3019@mixcom.mixcom.com>,  
<1994Jan25.014022.4991@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>  
Subject : Re: Code: Guarantying long-term proficiency

cory zito (czito@nyx10.cs.du.edu) wrote:

: Well geez guys lets get rid of the written test requirements too while we  
: are at it and allow it to become just another citizens band type  
: hobby!!! Gosh we only have to take the tests once if we advance a class

Let me get this straight, aside from the fact that most hams pass a code test there is no difference between CB and ham radio? I've listened to a few CB communications, though admittedly not too many, and amateur radio voice seems to be much more polite than and qualitatively better than what

I've heard on CB. So I can't agree that the code is what makes amateur radio different than CB. especially when over 60% of the hams don't even use CW.

: lets ABOLISH them because more people will be interested and we'll have a  
: wider variety of people to talk to! I agree that periodic code proficiency  
: would help but hey this is the same how many of you actually apply the  
: knowledge you gain in electronics from ham radio? How many of you just  
: remembered it all from physics class? Since so few of you use most of  
: the theory you have to learn to get the license lets DROP that  
: requirement too!!!

I use what I had to know to pass my exams rather frequently, thank you. While I am still an appliance operator for the most part I have taken apart all of my gear to one extent or another and I've built a number of small projects using what I learned studying for my amateur radio exam, power supplies, antennas, refrigerator wine cellar controller and the like. So, while I've had a little bit of experience with a soldering iron I've only ever had 1 CW qso (this may change soon). You can get killed or atleast earn an NAL by not knowing what is on the theory test. I've never heard of anyone getting killed because they couldn't send code.

: (This post is meant to be sarcastic for those of you who didn't realise it...:)

if this post was not meant to be constructive why did you post it?

- A) to offend those who haven't learned CW.
- B) you have nothing better to do with yourself.
- C) flamebait
- D) to prove that you are an angry person
- E) none of the above, please enlighten us.

: Its kind of silly to argue back and forth about this code is here and it  
: still is quite popular plus it is one of the things that sets (most)  
: amateurs apart from other radio operators!! digital modes are no more  
: practical than code and IMHO take most of the fun out of it especially

The difference is that no one is required to learn how to encrypt and manually send AX.25 packets in order to get an amateur license. If you suggest that code and digital are equally practical then why be required to encode in one mode but not the other? When has anyone argued against the use of code, or argued that someone should not use it?

: when I have the internet to play on radio is for person to person  
: communications not BBSes! Since many people who don't like code go for

: digital lets make everybody learn digital stuff...(besides there is a no  
: code tech for people who only want digital)

: The basic purpose of this post is to QUIT WHINING be THANKFUL for what  
: little we now have and if we continue to go against eachother we will  
: probably LOSE even more of it because of our QUIBBLING!!!

Gee.... here you go attacking people who don't have 1A endorsement and  
then you close by saying we should quit quibbling and fighting amongst  
ourselves.

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@KE6LW.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                      Internet: ddtodd@ucdavis.edu            *
*                      Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102           *
*                      Davis CA 95616                         *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

-----

Date: Tue, 25 Jan 1994 19:05:06 GMT  
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!  
gatekeeper.es.dupont.com!esds01.es.dupont.com!  
COLLINST%esvx19.es.dupont.com@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CK5nBI.5nn@world.std.com>, <Vy4ogc4w165w@mystis.wariat.org>,  
<CK6rp4.Azy@world.std.com>, <1994Jan25.141310.3817@cs.brown.edu>ont  
Reply-To : collinst@esvx19.es.dupont.com  
Subject : Re: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses

In article <1994Jan25.141310.3817@cs.brown.edu>, md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu  
(Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>In article <CK6rp4.Azy@world.std.com>,  
> drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

>

>|> I don't see what public policy is served by having them retake  
>|> the exams.

>

>1. It insures that they will be familiar with new operating rules  
> which have been enacted during their prolonged hiatus.

>

>2. It insures that they will be familiar with new technology being  
> used in amateur radio after their hiatus.  
>  
>Look at some of the new innovative modes implemented over the past  
>few years. Someone who was licensed in 1982 wouldn't be familiar with  
>today's regulations, let alone technology. Retesting would be a  
>correct step to assure they do. (Assuming theory tests were beefed  
>up and not dumbed-down further.)  
>  
>

And 3. It will ensure the Amateur Ranks shrink to its smallest number  
giving the FCC and Commerical outfits more reason to sell/buy our  
frequencies. (IMHO) There will be too many who don't want to sweat  
out tests every 5 or 10 years and will just give up on ARS as a hobby.

Thanks & 73                               |"Get your facts first, and then you can  
Tom WI3P                               | distort them as much as you please."  
collinst@esvax.dnet.dupont.com| Mark Twain  
\*\*\* MY EMPLOYER DOESN'T SPEAK FOR ME NOR I FOR THEM \*\*\*\*

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #24  
\*\*\*\*\*